DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 908 FL 001 131

By-Nelson, Robert J.

Realia and Realities: From Language to Literature.

Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association.

Pub Date Apr 65

Note-8p.; Abridged version of speech presented at Fall Conf of the Penna State Modern Lang Assn, Bucknell Univ, Lewisburg, Penna, Oct 10, 1964.

Journal Cit-Bull of the Pennsylvania State Modern Lang Assn; v43 n2 p65-72

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors-Audiolingual Methods, Cultural Context, Language Instruction, *Literature, *Modern Languages, Motivation Techniques, Oral Communication, *Reading Materials, Reading Skills, *Second Language Learning, Speech Skills, Teacher Role, *Teaching Methods

The separation of language study from literary study is advocated in this discussion of today's attitudes on language teaching. Observations of the slow rate of acquisition of speaking and reading skills even among better students leads to suggestions for changes in conventional allocations of time and function assigned to students and teachers as well as for the development and introduction of new reading materials. (AF)

ED026908

REALIA AND REALITIES: FROM LANGUAGE TO LITERATURE

Robert J. Nelson
University of Pennsylvania

We teachers of foreign-literature-in-the-original have not been unaware of the impact of the "New Key" to language learning which has opened so many doors in this "Post-Sputnik Era."* Whether we teach "language" or not, either in basic courses or as part of our literature courses, we do emphasize audio-lingual goals and we do attempt to apply what modern linguistics and technology (the camera, the tape recorder, etc.) have to offer. But have we actually faced up to the realities which these realia force upon us? Do we see the full implications of these new applications? Can we assume, as I fear too many of us do, that these new realia are simply convenient ways of doing business at the same old stand?

That business, or, better, mission, as we all know, is the communication of the cultural heritage of our particular language areas, chiefly through belles-lettres. This being our mission, there was, understandably, an early stage of suspicion of the "machine and its evil ways:" it was anti-intellectual; it would discourage the reading habit; it could at best teach the student how to order a cup of coffee; etc. But Sputnik changed all that. Or, at least, it produced a number of us who are less leery of the machine. In recent years there has been an "opening to the left," a softening of the traditional hostility to "applied linguistics" and the new technology. This "softening" has been aided by an important change in perspective among "New Key" thinkers themselves: of late, many such people have been speaking not of the machine but of the teacher as the best audio-lingual instrument. This is somewhat Thermidorean, a too-quick ascension of the moderates before the radicals have really had their say. Except at Cornell and institutions specializing exclusively in foreign-language study, I know of no college or school system which has boldly implemented applied linguistics and the use of the machine as envisaged, say, in A. Bruce Gaarder's exciting report of three years ago.[1] Assuming that each "class hour" normally calls for two hours of preparation, Gaarder proposed that the student spend thirteen hours on his own in a program relying heavily on the language laboratory and that the students in the program meet for one of two remaining hours in a session of comparative grammar and for the other in what might be called "mise en évidence." Gaarder's recommendations are born of the doubt that the present use of the classroom with its conventional allowances of five (or three) hours per week could ever be adequate for the avowed language goals of most institutions, and I want to return to these allowances later. Let me here stress that Gaarder's "radicalism" seems unnecessary to those now "softened" belletrists who feel that, indeed, in the "New Key" there may be not an enemy but a friend. The tape-machine, the television or totally audio-lingual teachers for those still afraid of the realia are now going to get through the "busy work" of learning the language in the first year, at the outside, and normally in the first semester. The student will thereby be ready, so much sooner, for the serious intellectual work which should be the real focus of his advanced "language education." To invest a cliché with some of its original intent: we can now have the human use of human beings.

Of which human beings? Those who seem likely to profit from this moderate "opening to the left" are the teaching human beings, not the learning human beings. Let me illustrate, from personal experience. A number of years ago, at one of the institutions in which I have taught, I was assigned the final semester in French of the required sequence of courses which satisfy the institution's language requirement. I conducted the course entirely in French, depending to a great extent on constant "question and answer." (This "Socratic" approach is valuable not only for its general intellectual worth but especially for its linguistic relevance.) Typically, this final "required" course was devoted primarily to literary study and the first assignment was Gide's *Le Retour de l'enfant prodigue* in a much annotated (that is, filled with

(cont. next page)

*This paper is a shortened version of a talk delivered at the Fall Conference of the Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., October 10, 1964. Prof. Nelson is Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Pennsylvania.

FL 001 131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

vocabulary aids) anthology of stories. After a few days of disappointment with the slow pace of the discussion, I decided to assess the average speaking rate of two or three of the good students, that is, students who had received a grade of B from the teacher in the previous semester. Now, radio officials with whom I have checked have empirically concluded that commercial copy (in a "soft-sell," as one of them delightfully put it) should not be read at a speed in excess of 150 words per minute and straight news much beyond a speed of 160 words per minute for intelligibility by the culturally heterogeneous radio and TV audience. Now, it is difficult to count words in French and, as one of my colleagues in linguistics reminds me, a "word" is really a visual phenomenon, a "unit of meaning" printed on a page with space between it and the next "unit of meaning." In spite of this difficulty, on the occasion in question I counted such units as best I could without the aid of a tape-recorder or other such device, simply conjecturing how many "space-framed units of meaning" a given student's utterance was likely to produce if written. The student's "delivery" helped a great deal, since, in his brave attempt to reconcile his brain speed and his tongue speed, he paused frequently enough for me to make my concealed count. At worst, unscientific, I know; at best, rudimentarily scientific. But, for what they are worth, I give you the results of such "experimentation," hoping that you will at least regard them as those of an "insightful observer": among three such students, in reply to questions designed to provoke answers chiefly of information rather than interpretation, the average rate of speech was sixty words per minute. Naturally, the talent for concision and condensation must be taken into account in such measurements. Again, the significant temporal and the linguistic units of measurement might both have to be other for any meaningful conclusions about rates of speech (respectively, the centi-second and the syllable, perhaps). And whatever units of measurement we use, not everybody is a chatterbox and every minute need not be filled. However, short of a foundation-supported scientific report on this neglected area, you will just have to take my word that the good students in question simply felt their way orally through at least one minute of speech, attempting to make utterances with no grammatical, phonological or semantic deviations which would mislead a normal speaker of French (a definition of fluency, by the way, which is more than adequate for the practical situations of classroom discussions).[2] In short, the students spoke slowly, at about one-third to one-half of their speed in English. And I remind you that this was in answer to questions eliciting information rather than interpretation.

This distinction seems crucial to me in the face of our continued emphasis on literary goals. There is little point in using worthwhile literature simply as a pretext for having students "tell the story in their own words." "Why" and "how" are far more important and interesting than "what" and "when" in the reading and discussing of worthwhile literature. But that we should still be no further than "what" and "when" in our literature courses tells us that we have ignored one of the chief lessons of the "New Key:" far from taking less time, the new methods take more time. Or, to put that in a different light, they take less time only if we radically recast the conventional allocations of time and functions assigned to student and teacher—as, for example, in Gaarder's proposals. And even after this saturated base, there must be sustained follow-up. But this leads back to the reality which is more likely to persist. We shall continue to receive only a small part of the student's curricular week. To change this would require activity which I can at best describe as "lobbying." Not that I am against lobbying. Our prestige in this post-Sputnik, NDEA era should encourage us to bolder action than that near-inaction which the "depression psychology" of the pre-war seems to have induced for many teachers who matured at that time. I do not think it unrealistic to ask for increases for forty or sixty percent in the class time allotted for language courses. But the cautions underlying Gaarder's radical program of language learning should guide even an expanded class-based program. After all, eight hours per week *is* limited considering the fact that the second-language learner spends most of his waking day (and, in that immeasurable Bergsonian *durée* which is the life of the psyche, perhaps all of his day) in a foreign country: his native land. On top of this psychological reality, there is a practical complication: the prospects for second-language training in grade school are not bright. According to a recent survey, FLES has been successful in only one school out of every eight and the causes of this failure are not likely to be remedied in the near future.[3] This portends that, for some time, the second-language learner will continue to be a young adult with an active mind that is being stimulated and stretched *in adult fashion* in every one of his other subjects and in-

terests. Is it any wonder that so many of our students in senior high school and lower college complain that language learning is so tedious and unrewarding?

But this is just the point at which we teachers must exercise maximum restraint—on ourselves. It is at this point that the basic insight of the "New Key" must be remembered and implemented: second-language learning seems to proceed best when based on the "natural" sequence of hearing-speaking-reading-writing. To be sure, as the linguist Stanley Sapon of the University of Rochester suggested to a panel of the American Psychological Association in 1963, we can help our students be more economical in imitation of the child learning language than the child is. But we should remember that the child is not a young adult explosively ready to respond to the significance of what he learns in a second language nor is he learning this provocative material in an atmosphere formally dedicated to the cultivation of such responses. In short, we teachers must take care that we do not let the student's head get ahead of his ear and his tongue.

The specifically literary study of written works must be postponed until the student is master of the active skills within a specific band of expressiveness. "Master" is a much abused superlative, I know, but perhaps my relating it to a specific band of expressiveness will serve at once as a caution and an encouragement. Now, the band of expressiveness in the original language will probably always be both broader and denser than in the second language. For example, to speak to that ancient concern of language-and-literature teachers, vocabulary, the student will know a greater number of words and number of connotations for any one of them in his native language. But however narrow and shallow the band of expressiveness in the second language, "ripeness is all" and ripeness is a matter of timing. If the insights of the "New Key" are valid, vocabulary is less significant than used to be thought, especially at the early stages.[4] The crucial items are not lexical but structural, the patterns or slots into which "words" fit and the learning of "words" is a matter of contextual need. To be sure, the contexts must expand if the student is ever to get on to worthwhile literature, but the very complexity of that literature, both linguistically and conceptually, should lead us teachers of language and literature to rely on other resources for the "tooling" phases of language learning.

I do not mean to ignore the question of student-motivation in all this. Perhaps naively, I assume that the student wants to learn the foreign language effectively. I know that the various psychologies of our time, whatever their internecine tendencies, share a deterministic view of character formation. Freudians, behaviorists, mentalists and positivists assume that the learner is a passive object whose network of "conditions" must be contended with surreptitiously, as it were, if any learning is to occur. Perhaps, naively, then, I look for a positive result from a forthright admission to the student of the difficulties we both face in his second-language learning. Perhaps I play into his cynical hands in appealing not to his viscera but to his will. Not so naively I think, I believe that the student to date has been alienated by the shotgun approach with which we confront him: a little of everything in the beginning, with a too early acceleration into an almost exclusively "cultural approach."

What we need is a carefully controlled experience of learning in which the student is an ally not an enemy. What is to be the form of this carefully controlled experience? For one thing, it seems to me that we must give up not only the notion that vocabulary is all important but also the related notion that, when it has to be learned, it should be done so in huge hunks arranged in an arithmetical series—you know: forty words a day. Properly delayed, the learning of vocabulary more likely takes place in a geometric series, although I am not able to report just what the ratio of progression might be. In fact, the whole idea of setting fixed lists of words to be learned seems to miss the point. One recent study indicates that we should be more concerned with how fast we **cannot** push the student rather than with how fast we **should** push him: Professor George Scherer's report on reading to the Northeast Conference of 1963 cautions that the frequency of new words in any reading assignment should be no greater than one in thirty-five before the student achieves what Scherer aptly calls the goal of "liberated reading."[5] For strongly cognate languages (at least visually cognate) your experience may suggest that this is too conservative a figure, but even cut in half, it gives some sense of the students' difficulties when we ask them to read writers like Balzac and Rimbaud.

Now I am not recommending the banning of the books in our language se-

(cont. next page)

quences. Recent experimentation with which I am slightly familiar seems to suggest reading is somewhat more useful for re-enforcing the active skills than had been thought till fairly recently.[6] But I am recommending the de-emphasis of the book as book or text and its use chiefly as pretext at the early stages. For, the use of writers of merit at this level chiefly for their cultural value seems to me sentimental and unrealistic even in the best school in the country. You name your own candidate for that slot. In fact, since each of us must be sure he is in the best school in the country at his level of education, he can measure the absurdity of such ambition for himself. Next time you enter a second or third year class, take time to have the students underline the words they do not know in a page or two of an upcoming assignment which they will not as yet have prepared. If my own experiments of this kind are any guide, you will find that even your good students—those whom I find **speaking** slowly — also **read** slowly in comparison with their rates of reading in English. I do not mean to advocate those rates which "speed reading" schools now promise. As a teacher of literature, I deplore the assumptions guiding some of the apostles of such techniques—especially the notion that we read only for information. The significance of style and form can thus only suffer further disfavor with the American student who already shows great diffidence before "art" in any of its forms.

Atop all this, it must be emphasized in the face of so much that is **new** in our profession that the **old** demands of literary study are still very much with us and continually valid: the sensitive reading of a text takes time even when one reads at exceptionally fast rates; effective discussion of a thoroughly assimilated work takes much skill on the part of teacher and student. Serious literature is as demanding an inquiry into the nature of reality as philosophy, natural science, social science. And who would dare to assume that these should conduct their inquiries with the imperfect tool of an inadequately controlled language? Again, **demands**, old and new, must be faced under ever-worsening conditions of work: ever-larger enrollments of students are assigned to grade-school type classrooms in which the very architecture dictates against the Socratic basis of sound language learning and literary study: the teacher sits at a desk raised above those of the students "pre-disposed" in front of him to receive the sacred gospel. However, as a language teacher, I must also recognize that a rate of reading significantly below the student's reading rate in English (one-third to one-half of this, say) is bound to hamper his rate of learning the other skills of the second language. Thus, the student's relatively slow rates of reading and speaking imply that when the student participates, the teacher must weigh the power of expression more than the level of sensibility seeking expression.

Now, to some extent the relation between language and literature manifests C. P. Snow's much publicized theses of the Two Cultures.[7] Certainly, in language training, the impact of the technological and scientific revolution of the mid-twentieth century has sharpened distinctions between **goals** and **techniques**, if not between goals or "cultures" themselves. And it is true that many literature teachers still see in the teaching machine and applied linguistics not only an anti-intellectualism with presumably bad pedagogical implications for literary study, but also a more fundamental source of disagreement about ultimate values. As Snow maintains, the community of letters in our time tends to be pessimistic about the human condition and regards the optimism of men of science as ill-founded and naive both psychologically and historically. Indeed, Lionel Trilling and Stephen Spender have written recently about the characteristic "refusals" by the **modern** Literary Man of the rationalist bases of our science-dominated, positivistic age.[8] Again, we are all familiar with the "philistinism" literary people so readily assume in their philological colleagues or the "fuzziness" which philologists assume in their literary colleagues. But I am not concerned to perpetuate a division here. Even if Snow's thesis is right, were literary people to turn to a more up-lifting literature (that strain of contemporary letters which Spender identifies as reactionary, ironically enough), they would still find that their students could not read and discuss this literature any faster than the other.

Does this mean that anything is better than nothing at all—that reading a little of a worthwhile author is better than no reading at all or better than the reading of non-literature? I do not think so. Whatever the degree of vocabulary control on the part of the student, the very idea of chopping up Balzac or Camus or any other writer of merit into five- or

six-page snippets seems to me culturally disrespectful and pedagogically harmful. It destroys esthetic effect and it encourages the student to think that any work is a mere occasion for **effects and levels of response** other than those which the author elicits from his fellow countrymen. Needless to say, such a habit of reading-in-bits does not square either with the student's reading experience in English. Except for specialized stylistic studies, courses in English literature presuppose the pre-class completion of long works, or at least esthetically significant long portions of them. So, before the student is capable of what has come to be called "liberated reading" and, just as importantly, if our goal of individual development is to be more than a shibboleth, before the student is capable of "liberated speaking," the literary inclusions of most curricula I have seen must be considered far too ambitious.

Unless one wants to compromise. A number of years ago, when discussing these matters with a colleague who teaches German, I expressed astonishment at his plan to include Mann's *Der Zauberberg* in a third-year, final-required course in his college. I remembered too well my own struggle with the **translation** of the work when I was a Freshman in college. "Oh," he blandly replied, "not in the original—I'll just have them read thirty or forty pages in the original—they can finish the rest in translation and then we can talk about it." I did not ask him in what language he and his students would "talk about" it. But such compromises are altogether too frequent—and not only in the purportedly harder language of German. Of course, the compromise need not take the form of recourse to English (for either speaking or reading). It can betray the unique basis of American education, its emphasis on the student, and take the form of a course in which the **teacher** does all the talking. Frankly, the students should use English, if that is the only way in which they can participate in the rich intellectual experience of books like *Der Zauberberg*.

But this does not seem to be the choice confronting us as language teachers. The choices seem to me more moral than technically professional: will we face up to the demands of time and the exclusions of subject matter which a serious approach to our stated professional goals calls for? The demands of time must be related to the learning rate, in all skills, of the student, not the "interest-rate" of the teacher. Perhaps unfairly to a charming writer who might never have envisaged his academic destiny, we can call the teacher-oriented course an expression of the "Daudet syndrome." At one time, every French syllabus seemed to have its quota of Daudet tales. Times change and Daudet is replaced by other writers, but the syndrome persists and we get reading materials having little bearing on the powers and kinds of expression which a modern reality would call for and would make possible for the second-language learner in school or college.

In speaking of "modern reality" I do not mean to advocate the substitution of Sartre, say, for Daudet. If anything, I am suspicious of the contention that the best place to start literature is with the twentieth century because, being a part of his own time, it will gain the student's interest most readily. This seems a pedagogically unsound reason for using a text: precisely because the student is *engagé*, he wants to respond at a much faster (and more intense) rate than if the material were less provocative. For the very early reading materials, one must, to adapt a concept used by sound engineers, be wary of creating "cultural interference" or "noise." Not that we must feed the students pap. Let us scotch that straw man right away. Obviously, a very careful relation between student interest and student ability to respond in all four skills (especially—reading, hearing and **speaking**) must be maintained. Individual ability indices must be related to the norms of the group of which the individual is a member and it should be possible to have different parts of the group progressing at different rates. (And, to pose another moral problem, we should insist that these groups be small—at most, fifteen and, at best, ten. School boards and trustees must be made to act in good faith as well.)

As for the works themselves, the implications of Scherer's study as well as the frequency lists now being provided through Alphonse Juilland's extensive research,[9] call for a radical departure from the traditional practice of leaving the choice of texts to a small group of two or three people at the end of the semester (some of whom will not be returning perhaps in the Fall). The ALM people have written their own materials in close correlation with the vocabulary ranges achieved at various levels. It might also be possible to adapt certain works of good writers to the needs of particular groups, but, as a literary critic, I would caution

(cont. next page)

that one would then have to present such "edited" texts in an admittedly different frame of reference and, I suspect, in most cases, simply decide against the editing as too costly to the esthetic or cultural import of the work. As for the presentation of these invented or edited texts, much of our own scholarly training will be of little help, since the last thing we want to do is lecture—at least, if the goal is "liberated speaking" by the student. We must find ways of encouraging the student to speak and my own experience is that it is best to look beyond **our** professional experience to that of others who are involved in problems of communication. We have done so to a certain extent in relying on dramatic readings and presentations, but this seems of limited value when the goal is **spontaneous** utterance. More useful models are to be found in the round table discussions of the radio and television panel show. The teacher is still present, sitting as unobtrusively as possible in a corner of the room for a substantial portion of the class period while the students conduct their own discussion of the topic of the hour. And to the extent that experience in the technique puts the students at ease, it is possible to record such sessions by way of showing students just what t h e i r linguistic strengths and weaknesses are. Nor should it be thought that this use of class time finds students with little to say. The ease of having to "defend" one's position without having to answer for every syllable is apparently a liberating experience in itself. As for the dangers of irrelevancy and irresponsibility which such techniques might invite, the quiet presence of the teacher in his corner provides a sufficient control on such tendencies without at the same time inhibiting the free flow of discussion.

Am I putting us out of business, particularly those of us who usually teach in the "stratosphere" of the "higher learning?" I think not. If anything, it seems to me that genuinely fluent students would want to go on to "elective" courses, especially if they did not have to face the prospect of a teacher either obliged to "help them with their French" or "give up on their French." But am I open to the more serious charge of wanting to reserve literary study exclusively for the upper echelons—for the college teacher, in particular? I think not. I am concerned with valid learning sequences wherever they occur. Moreover, such a question reflects the teacher-oriented approach which is in large part responsible for many of the dilemmas of language study. To be sure, the teacher must also be stimulated by the "subject matter" and the ideal of the teacher as a repository of the culture he wishes to transmit is still valid. But, at the moment, the teacher seems so much beyond the student that the student does not relate the example of the teacher as a second-language user to his own goals as a language student. Little wonder that the language requirement is viewed by so many of our students as just another hurdle in the race for the sheepskin.

To change this relation between the student and his goals, teachers must sacrifice their sense of importance in the educational process. At the lower or required level of the process, this means a deemphasis and more likely an exclusion of the literary monument or the extremely provocative work. The exclusion is called for not only because of the inappropriateness of such works for the student's linguistic capacities at that level, but also because of the temptation which such works present for the teacher to dominate the student's learning process. What will fill the vacuum? What can be both so sweet and useful as literature, the best that man has written? I am not so convinced as some "New Key" thinkers that the material **must** be interesting, that the content is so important at the early stages of reading. I suspect that students are readier than we teachers to accept the thesis that, till the language is controlled in its basic patterns, interest based on content is better sacrificed to efficiency. On the other hand, if interest is so important, a completely new look at the problem of content is called for. Worthwhile literature, I insist, is ill-adapted to present second and third year standard courses.[10] But there are contents which are nonetheless interesting. Though I have acknowledged that non-literary areas like social science and history themselves demand an adequately controlled language, unlike imaginative literature they do lend themselves to a denotational, almost exclusively informative phase beyond the "me-Jane, you-Tarzan" level which some fear is the inevitable substance of "non-literary" reading material. I am also convinced that materials about the student's own reality — his American reality — might serve as the content of readers for the stages prior to liberated reading and liberated speaking. Such materials, it seems to me, avoid the problem of new concept formation about the foreign culture at a

time when the student is more concerned with the basically linguistic problem of learning patterns and meanings.

To be sure, at some point in the process, literature, imaginative works of real merit, should be introduced. "Should" because it is every student's **right** to inherit the patrimony of the past and not, as too often in the past and, I fear, in the present perspective of some literary teachers, the privilege of the few. "Should" also because of the resources of satisfaction which literature provides to the increasingly leisure centered society which the scientific revolution is making possible. But the introduction of worthwhile literature should also be an occasion for self-denial—on the part of the teacher. At the risk of stirring up an old argument I must say that "critical" rather than "historical" approaches to literary works should be adopted when literature is introduced. In fact, this choice should apply at all levels of literary study, if literature is to continue as an autonomous area of study. But "critical" approaches seem especially called for at the early stages because they keep the student close to the experience **from** which and **about** which he derives his linguistic needs on the occasion in question.

The radical separation between language study and literary study which I have proposed may seem unwise and unnecessary to some of you. But, like Gaarder's proposals for the learning of the language, my understanding of the relation between language and literature expresses both my hope and my despair. I have seen too many products of our "shotgun" approach to language learning to believe that it really works. This is my despair. But my hope is that, out of a willingness to seek a better system, we can soon be done with the anomaly of a "language requirement" which, in attempting to satisfy language-and-literature, satisfies neither. What we really need is a "foreign-literature-in-the-original requirement," the very existence of which would have a strong retroactive influence on the early stages of language learning and teaching.

In an age in which the three- or four-day weekend and the two-hour flight abroad on the month-long vacation will soon be a part of the modern reality (at least for the vastly expanded college trained part of the population), we teachers cannot continue to console ourselves, as some of us do, with the self-flattering assumption that "language ability" is a rare gift, or that, as successful users of foreign languages we vindicate not only our own genetic inheritance but our own early training in second-language learning. To be sure, as Chomsky reminded Skinner in a famous review of the latter's **Verbal Behavior,** language learning is a mysterious, complex process and we should be leery of pat formulas concerning it.[11] But John Carroll also reminds us that the process is not so mysterious as to defy understanding and it seems reasonable to assume that, given the proper motivation and time, anyone with normal intelligence can learn a foreign language.[12] Chomsky's sense of complexity coupled with Carroll's assurances perhaps calls for the creation of as natural conditions of language learning as possible and we should all be working for a semester abroad — at least for our language majors.[13] But economic realities suggest that for a fairly long time to come we shall have to train all our language learners in the "artificial" conditions of the present and the past. Our time will have to be what we make of it. This is Carroll's assumption. It is an assumption which we teachers live each day — or should. Indeed, if we do not share this assumption, at least as it applies to that half of our school-age population which goes on to college (or even to that portion of the college freshmen who finally graduate), we are failing to communicate with a great many people. We are especially guilty of that greatest failure in communication—with ourselves.

NOTES

[1] "The Basic Course in Modern Foreign Languages," **Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages, by the Modern Language Association of America: 1959-1961** (New York: The Modern Language Association Foreign Language Research Center, 1962), pp. 168-172.

[2] In his influential **Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice** (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), Nelson Brooks stresses the importance of speed of speech in effective second-language learning, but he gives no specifics of measurement (p. 223).

[3] Nancy V. Alkonis and Mary A. Brophy, "A Survey of FLES Practices," **Reports of Surveys and . . . ,** pp. 213-217. In all fairness, I should report that this ratio is based on a survey of sixty-two school systems.

[4] In his seminal **Language** (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933), Leonard Bloomfield uncompromisingly maintains that the "myth about peasants, working men or savages who use only a few hundred words has no foundation in fact; in so far as one can count words (ignoring, for instance, the inflected forms of a language like ours), every adult speaker uses at least somewhere around 20,000 to 30,000 words; if he is educated—that is, if he knows technical and learned words—he uses many more" (p. 277). "Uses" is, of course, an

(cont. next page)

absolute and exhaustive term; in dealing with even the most verbally demanding of daily realities (say, driving a cab or college teaching), "users" do not exhaust their vocabularies. In this connection, Robert Lado makes a fairly sharp distinction between "production vocabulary" and "recognition vocabulary," with the former related especially to speaking, the latter to reading. Although he notes that reading vocabularies range as high as 80,000 "basic and derived words" for Grade 12 readers, he estimates that minimum production vocabularies are around 3,000 to 4,000 lexical units. The concept of "lexical unit" stretches the old-fashioned concept of word, to be sure, but the ratio of production vocabulary to recognition vocabulary is still obviously quite low. See **Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests** (London: Longmans, 1961), pp. 182-185.

[6] "Reading for Meaning," **Reports of the Working Committees, 1963 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages**, ed. William F. Bottiglia, pp. 22-60. Conference address: Secretary-Treasurer, Northeast Conference, c/o Modern Language Association of America, 6 Washington Square North, New York, N. Y. 10003.

[7] My colleague at the University of Pennsylvania, André Malécot, Professor of Romance Languages, suggests that such correlations might result from his current research on sound production.

[8] C. P. Snow, **The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution**, The Rede Lecture: 1959 (Cambridge University Press, 1959).

[9] Lionel Trilling, "On the Modern Element in Modern Literature," **Varieties of Literary Experience**, ed. Stanley Burnshaw (New York University Press, 1962), pp. 407-434; Stephen Spender, **The Struggle of the Moderns** (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1963).

[10] Juilland has studied word frequencies in each of the Romance Languages for different settings or realities. The results of his research will soon be available through Mouton and Company, Publishers, The Hague.

[11] A few remarks by the linguist Robert Lado seem especially pertinent here: "The objective in teaching a foreign literature is not as a rule to train writers for the production of literary masterpieces in that language . . . The chief objective should be to teach appreciation of a foreign literature, i.e. capacity to experience it fully . . . The widely used practice of simplifying literature by restricting its vocabulary and grammar complexity is questionable . . . It seems more justifiable to prepare the student for the literary piece than to doctor the work to bring it down to the level of the students." **Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach** (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964), pp. 154-155. (My italics.)

[12] Noam Chomsky, **Language**, XXXV (1959), 26-58.

[13] **The Study of Language** (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 193. In all fairness to Carroll I should quote a recent caution uttered by him on the implications of linguistics for the teaching of other subjects: " . . . the idea that linguistics has much to contribute to educational problems in the 'language arts' has become almost embarrassingly fashionable. One's embarrassment comes from the fact that despite certain very definite and positive contributions that linguistics can make to these endeavors, these contributions are of relatively small extent. Once we adopt such fundamental tenets of linguistics as primacy of speech over writing, the structure of the language code as a patterning of distinctive communicative elements, and the arbitrariness of standards and usage, and work out their implications in detail, we find we are still faced with enormous problems of methodology in the teaching of such subjects as English, reading and foreign languages." "Words, Meanings and Concepts," **Harvard Educational Review**, XXXIV, No. 2 (Spring 1964), 179, n. 2. It is the thesis of my paper that, even when they have adopted the "fundamental tenets" Carroll cites, language-and-literature teachers have not worked out "their implications in detail."

[14] In his talk at the morning session of the PSMLA Fall Conference, Professor Thomas Magner expressed grave misgivings about "study abroad" before the student has had considerable formal training in the foreign language. I share these misgivings.

From *The Bulletin of the Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association*, Vol. XLIII, No. 2 (April 1965), pp. 65-72.